



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Genetic Relationship of the North American Indian Languages. By PAUL RADIN. May 31, 1919 (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, XIV. 489-502).<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Radin undertakes in this paper to prove the genetic relationship of all North American Indian languages. He notes by the way of introduction that owing to the recent tendency of certain Americanists to consolidate various stocks which had previously been considered independent, or at least not demonstrably genetically related to any other stocks, the thesis maintained in the above paper will not come as much of a shock. That he accepts the conclusions of these Americanists quite irrespective of whether or not they have proved their cases goes without saying. Incidentally he takes the occasion to belittle the work of Professor Boas and his school who have insisted that accurate analytical grammatical sketches of American Indian languages based on texts are an indispensable preliminary before the question of genetic relationship may be safely broached. It should be clearly borne in mind that neither Professor Boas nor any member of his school (so far as I am aware) has ever maintained that the Powellian classification of American Indian languages north of Mexico was final or that every stock listed as independent has been so *ab initio*. They have simply maintained that it is incumbent upon claimers of genetic relationships to prove their cases, and not to rely on guess work. (See Boas, Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part I 44 sq.; Michelson, Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, IX 222 sq.)

If this article were not by a person who holds a responsible position in a reputable university and if it were not printed in an estimable medium, it might safely be ignored. Such however is not the case. I do not pretend to knowledge of every stock cited, but have an independent knowledge of Siouan, Algonquian, Chinookan, and Yuchean (which last is not cited); and it is on these that my criticisms rest.

The author has seized upon every morphological element in one language that even remotely resembles that of another;

<sup>1</sup> This review is printed with permission of the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

words of one language which in any way resemble those of another are compared irrespective of whether or not the same or different morphological elements are under observation; words are divided in such a way as to make it appear that they have elements in common even if the division cuts in two morphological units and violates the grammar of the particular language cited; no phonetic laws are given and duly proved as an aid to establishing the genetic relationship of the languages; the writer has such a poor control of Algonquian that he blindly follows the errors of previous workers in Algonquian without once pointing them out: he is satisfied so long as he can abstract anything that will apparently bolster his case. I do not think I shall be contradicted by sober philologists when I say that, with such methods, the genetic relationship of any two languages on the face of the globe could be maintained. In short, in Radin we have the return of a Campbell, Trombetti, Dennison, Gašpičev Gržetič, on whom and their like see the sane remarks of Chamberlain, *American Anthropologist* (N. S.) XIV 51 sq. After such an arraignment it is no more than proper to sustain the charges by actual evidence, which I now proceed to give by a detailed examination of the Algonquian material.

NOUNS (the numbers are those of R's list).

2. Belly; miss-ad, Al. Ojib. Such division is against Ojibwa grammar. 5. Bone; ka-n, Al. Ojib. Wrong division: Fox A'kan", bone. 10. Cold; ka-dj, Al. Ojib. Possibly right division. 13. Eye; osh-kinji (queried), mistake for oshkinjig; translation wrong: o="his"; Baraga nishkinjig "my eye". See 17. 15. Foot; oka-d, Al. Ojib. Translation wrong: it is "his foot"; division o-kad; Baraga nikâd "my leg"; ni="my". 16. Ear; tawa-k, Al. Ojib. No reason to divide the word so; is against current ideas of Algonquian grammar. 17. Hair; oshkin-jig, Al. Ojib. Mistranslation: same word as in 13; observe that the same word is divided in two different ways according as it suits Radin's purpose. 18. Hand; otchi-tji, Al. Ojib. Not an Ojibwa word; taken from Baraga without even noticing that Baraga cites it as a Cree word (see p. 1 of his dictionary); mitchitji is also given by Baraga: divide o-; translation "his hand". 19. Head; cti-gwan, Al. Ojib.: no suffix -gwan in Ojibwa. 20. Hill; wa-djiw, Al. Ojib.: division violates Ojibwa grammar. 26. Mouth; odo-n, Al. Ojib. Queried by Radin. Translation wrong; "his tongue" correct rendition: division o-don; Fox -tunâ- "mouth, tongue"; Radin seems to have ignored nindôn "my tongue" and odôn "his tongue" (both cited by Baraga) because both would be unfavorable to his attempt to connect odo-n (sic) with Kwakiutl su-ms(!). 29. Nose; odja-ni, Al. Ojib.; mis-

print for odja-nj? See Baraga who gives complete evidence that the division is o-djandj "his nose"! Same observations as above. 31. Rain; gi-miwan, Al. Ojib. Shows lack of knowledge of Algonquian morphology; stem gimī-, Fox kemiyāwi "it rains" [kemi- stem; y glide; -ā- inan. copula; -wi 3d sing. inanimate, independent mode]. 32. Sleep; ni-ba, Al. Ojib. Owing to the treatment of n- of stems in composition, it is not possible to know definitely whether this division is right or not; any way n-iba would probably be the division if it is to be divided at all. But I do not lay any stress on this. 33. Snake gine-big, Al. Ojib. Division wrong. 34. Snow; me, Al. Fox. Taken from Jones without knowing that this stem can not be substantiated. 36. Sun; gi-siss, Al. Ojib. Fox kī'ce's<sup>WA</sup> would have set Radin right in all probability; division gi- impossible. 38. Tooth; bi-d, Al. Ojib. No such word; wrongly extracted from nibid (my tooth) and kibid (thy tooth) both cited by Baraga; lack of independent knowledge of related Algonquian languages made Radin take ni- as "my" and ki- as "thy"; whereas the division is n-ibid, k-ibid (Fox nī-, kī-, not ne-, ke-)<sup>1</sup>; if he had only used a little care he would have noted wibid "his tooth" also cited by Baraga which can only be w-ibid. 41. Water; pō, Al. Fox; ni-bi, Al. Ojib. Radin apparently does not know Fox nep<sup>1</sup>, "water," the equivalent of Ojibwa nibi; of course the two Fox citations can have nothing to do with each other.

## VERBS.

1. to be; -ka, Al. Ojib. Probably merely to make denominative verbs; Fox -'kā-, -'kā-. 18. to speak; te, Al. Fox. Taken from Jones' sketch of Fox; Radin is quite unaware that there is no such stem; the supposed stem te was abstracted from such forms as netenā<sup>WA</sup>, etc.; but these stand for netinā<sup>WA</sup>, etc. with vowel-assimilation and belong with ähinātc<sup>1</sup> (Jones' transcription; 'ä'inā<sup>d</sup>tc' in mine). 23. to talk; ka-n, Al. Fox. Misprint for ka-n; taken without criticism from the above mentioned sketch; stem kanaw-; division ka-n violates Fox grammar.

## NUMERALS.

1. Three; n-iswi, Al. Ojib. No such prefix in Ojibwa numerals. Before taking such an element from the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, it must be shown that in all cases we are dealing with the same morphological unit, which is demonstrably not true. In any case I submit that it is a far cry from niswi to Choctaw tutchina, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Cree nepit "my tooth", cited by Watkins, points in the same direction.

## MORPHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS.

5. Causative; -t-, Al. Fox. With inanimate objects only, and so not a fair comparison. 10. Dubitative; -k-, Al. Fox (sign of potential). No such element in Fox; is -k- meant? Comparison with Ojibwa gonima is wrong, for a similar termination occurs in Fox. 28. Imperative; ta, Al. Ojib. First person incl. only, and so not a fair comparison. 36. Interrogative; ä-, Al. Fox. Queried. Nothing to do with interrogation. 43. Nominal suffix; -ma, Al. Ojib. Probable error for -man. 51. Passive; -tä- (middle voice), Al. Fox. Used only with inanimate subject or subjects; hence not a legitimate comparison. 59. Plural distributive; -d (in verbs), Al. Ojibw. Error. 60. Plural; -n, Al. Ojib. Used to pluralize inanimate nouns; should be given as -AN; <sup>1</sup> it is a piece of daring to compare this with Tsimshian l- when the former is restricted as mentioned and Tsimshian l- is used pre-eminently with verbs.<sup>2</sup> If Radin abstracts -n from -on in verbs (which are inanimate and of the independent mode) he should know that in final analysis the ending is the same as in inanimate nouns (-on contracted from -wan after consonants). 62. Plural; -ke, Ai. Ojib. Special use if genuine, and so not comparable. 73. Transitive suffix; -t- Al. Fox. Queried. Not a fair comparison as it is used only when the object or objects are inanimate.

Radin's reply will probably be that the word-divisions he postulates must be right as shown by the non-Algonquian languages, which, he claims, are genetically related. This is simply begging the question. I do not wish to imply that Radin has not cited correctly a single Algonquian word; but I do claim to have disproved more than three quarters of his Algonquian comparisons; and this fact does not inspire much confidence in the correctness of the remainder.

On a previous occasion I pointed out how easy it is to find chance coincidences between Algonquian and other languages (Journal of the Washington Academy of Science, IX 230 sq.); but I can not refrain from adding a few examples here:—Fox magi- "big", Latin mag-nus; Fox yā- "go", Skt. yā; Fox -'sit' "if he, she be" (auxiliary, Latin sit [Fox -'si-, -t-, -"; Latin s-i-t], Fox -guni- "day", Turkish gun. In all seriousness I maintain that these comparisons are fully as close as those made by Radin. I am, by the way, surprised that he did not claim the genetic relationship of all American Indian languages when he was at it, for Moseteno, a South American

<sup>1</sup> Owing to various phonetic changes, this can not always be easily shown by the evidence of Ojibwa alone.

<sup>2</sup> Algonquian does not possess the plural "groups" of Tsimshian nor Tsimshian the Algonquian grammatical distinction of animate and inanimate.

Indian language, uses *m* (so widely spread) as the pronoun of the second person singular.

It must not be denied that Radin in one or two instances has corrected his predecessors in their vagaries, e. g., he no longer attempts to connect Yurok *-m* with anything Algonquian, nor Wiyot *-it*.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion I wish to make it clear that I do not deny that some day it may be possible to prove the genetic relationship of North American Indian languages; but I do deny that Radin has proved it: what he has given is an exhibition of linguistic anarchy.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Lietuviškos ir angliškos kalbų žodynas. Trečias spaudimas.

By A. LALIS. Chicago, 1915. Litovskij Slovari. By A. JUŠKEVIČ. St. Petersburg, 1897 ff.

Despite the long line of Lithuanian dictionaries of various sorts that have been issued within the last two centuries, there is still no single authority to which the seeker after a Lithuanian word can turn with instinctive confidence. One tries first the most likely dictionary; if that fails one goes from source to source until the word is found or the seeker has exhausted the resources of his library or his patience. Every student of Balto-Slavic or Indo-European would, therefore, heartily welcome any real contribution to Lithuanian lexicography.

Both of these dictionaries have genuine, though contributory, value; but at present neither is generally available to the American philologist. The *Lalis*, published by a Lithuanian newspaper in Chicago, is familiar to most English-speaking Lithuanians, but Trautmann (*Die altpreuussischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Göttingen, 1910) is almost alone in using it for purposes of linguistic research. The *Juškevič* is frequently referred to by German scholars, but it cannot be very well known in this country; numerous inquiries among the literati, institutional libraries, and native Lithuanians have so far revealed only one copy. And yet the *Lalis* and the *Juškevič* are the most important Lithuanian dictionaries published within the past generation.

There is no need for comparison between the two; their aims are quite different. The *Lalis*, a well-printed, well-bound volume of 1274 double-columned pages (the English-Lithuanian part almost twice as large as the Lithuanian-English), makes

<sup>1</sup> See the warning by Michelson, *Am. Anthropol.*, N. S., XVI 364.